



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,360	08/08/2001	Jean-Jacques Moreau	01807.001288.	8922

5514 7590 09/11/2008
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-19, 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29, and 31-35 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-19, 21, 23, 26, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce et al. (6,154,733) (hereinafter Pierce) in view of Desai et al. (6,877,093) (hereinafter Desai).

4. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-19, 21, 23, 26, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pierce et al. (6,154,733) (hereinafter Pierce) in view of Desai et al. (6,877,093) (hereinafter Desai).

5. As per claims 1 and 21, Pierce discloses a method and device of determining a configuration profile for an electronic document processing peripheral, the configuration

Art Unit: 2154

profile representing a set of configuration parameters defining an operating mode of the peripheral, a set of fixed values of the parameters defining a particular configuration of the peripheral, said method implemented in a communication network that includes at least one client station (204,208, 150, fig 3, col 4, lines 4-21; col 6, lines 36-67), at least one server station and at least one processing peripheral comprising the steps of:

obtaining (504) a user identification data item (obtaining the user profile, col 4, lines 15-21; col 6, lines 54-57) from a request sent by a client station (150, fig 3, col 4, lines 15-21; col 6, lines 36-53) operated by said user (150, fig 3, col 4, lines 22-24; col 6, lines 36-53);

determining (506) user characteristics (col 4, lines 15-21) as a function (postage printing, col 4, lines 4-22) of the user identification data item (user profile data, col 4, lines 13-22; col 6, lines 36-53, postage meter per account);

determining (508), as a function of the user characteristics (user profile data includes set parameter, col 4, lines 13-22; col 6, lines 34-67; col 7, lines 10-39) and of the peripheral identification data item (postage meter per account, col 6, lines 36-46), a configuration profile (ad data profile, fig 5, col 8, lines 41-67) applicable for configuring (software firmware, col 7, lines 40-50) the operating mode of the peripheral (618, fig 4, col 6, line 54 to col 7, line 5; col 11, lines 4-23) for a document processing (600-618, fig 4, col 6, line 54 to col 7, line 5), request coming from said user (user profile data includes set parameter for controlling third party advertising, 600-618, fig 4, col 4, lines 15-21); and

sending (516) configuration profile (ad data profile, fig 5, col 8, lines 41-67) determined to the client station (150 fig 1, col 4, lines 15-21) operated by said user (150, fig 1, col 4, lines 5-21, postage printing system).

Pierce teaches obtaining the user profile from the central data center to print postal indicia on an envelope further user profile is used to identify message data (col 4, lines 4-25). Pierce does not explicitly teach obtaining a peripheral identification data item to configuring the operating mode of the peripheral device. However, Desai teaches obtaining a peripheral identification data item to configuring the operating mode of the peripheral_device (device id, col 11, lines 40-45; col 13, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching where user can set their system profile and associate profile for other devices/terminal for configuration updates taught by Desai into the system of the Pierce to host user profile and associated peripheral device at remotely located central data center for remotely configuring peripheral (postage system).

6. As per claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the peripheral identification data item is extracted (504) from a request sent by a client station to the server station (data center establishes one postage meter per account so it is part of the user account/profile col 6, lines 36-44), the request being a document processing request or a request to obtain a configuration profile (col 4, lines 15-37).

7. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Desai discloses the said steps of determining user characteristics and determining a configuration profile are accomplished by means of a database (col 13, lines 1-20) in which there are stored, associated together, peripheral data each representing an identity of a peripheral, user data representing user characteristics, and configuration data each representing a configuration profile (col 13, lines 1-20).

8. As per claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Desai discloses if required by the client station, updating (604, 606) a configuration of the peripheral in a context of the configuration profile applicable (col 13, lines 1-20).

9. As per claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses receiving (500) from the client station a request for obtaining the configuration profile applicable (col 4, lines 15-30); determining and sending (508, 516) to the client station the configuration profile applicable (ad data profile, fig 3-6, col 8, lines 41-67); and

receiving (600) from the client station the configuration profile applicable with parameter having a modified value (ad data profile, fig 3-6, col 8, lines 41-67).

10. As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the user identification data item is a chain of characters

Art Unit: 2154

identifying a user and a password entered by the user in order to connect the user to the client station (col 7, lines 59-67).

11. As per claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the user characteristics indicate a level of service subscribed to by a user (fig 3-6, col 6, lines 54-67; col 8, lines 41-67).

12. As per claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses in that a level of service subscribed to by a user is defined according to a financial sum paid by a user (postage evidence system, 208, fig 2, col 6, lines 36-53).

13. As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the peripheral identification data item is a network address of the peripheral (col 6, lines 36-67).

14. As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the configuration data each represent a configuration profile indicate an electronic address of a computer object containing a configuration profile (col 5, line 63 to col 6 line 35).

15. As per claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses in that the network is an Internet (col 5, lines 1-9).

16. As per claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the client station and server station communicate using an HTTP protocol (internet, col 5, lines 1-9).

17. 28. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Desai discloses the electronic address of a computer object containing a configuration profile is an address of a uniform resource locator (URL) type and the computer object is an object defined in an annotation language of an extended mark-up language (XML) type (col 10, lines 59-67; col 13, lines 1-20; the POS configuration system is web-enabled and HTML, XML are the script language used).

18. As per claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses generating and sending (400-410) to the server station a request to configure an electronic document processing peripheral, the request including a user identification data item and a peripheral identification data item (postage evidence system, 208, fig 2, col 6, lines 36-53); receiving (412, 414) a configuration profile of the peripheral from the server station, in response to the configuration request (fig 3-6, col 6, lines 54-67; col 8, lines 41-67).

Art Unit: 2154

19. As per claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses displaying (416) said configuration profile (fig 2); modifying (420, 422) a current configuration associated with the configuration profile (fig 2-5, col 8, lines 41-67).

20. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the peripheral configuration uses a peripheral driver, further comprising the step of, when the peripheral driver is stored in the server station: sending (434) to the server station the configuration profile containing the modified configuration (fig 2-5, col 8, lines 41-67; col 11, lines 5-23).

21. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses the configuration of the peripheral uses a peripheral driver, further comprising the step of, when the peripheral driver of the peripheral is locally stored in the client station: using (426) the configuration profile for configuring the peripheral driver (fig 2-5, col 8, lines 41-67; col 11, lines 5-23).

22. As per claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Pierce discloses electronic document processing peripheral, said method comprising determining a configuration profile in accordance with any one of claim 1 (ad data profile, fig 2-5, col 8, lines 41-67; col 11, lines 5-23).

23. As per claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 3, above.

24. As per claim 26, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

25. As per claim 28, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

26. As per claim 30, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2-19, above. In addition, Pierce discloses a server station (200 fig 1) a client station (150, fig 1).

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments filed 08/10/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1, 3-19, 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30 is maintained.

28. In response to applicant's argument that prior art of Desai is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the

claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Pierce teaches obtaining the user profile from the central data center to print postal indicia on an envelope further user profile is used to identify message data (col 4, lines 4-25). Desai teaches obtaining a peripheral identification data item to configuring the operating mode of the peripheral_device (device id, col 11, lines 40-45; col 13, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching where user can set their system profile and associate profile for other devices/terminal for configuration updates taught by Desai into the system of the Pierce to host user profile and associated peripheral device at remotely located central data center for remotely configuring peripheral (postage system). In view of the Supreme Court's recent opinion in *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, In *KSR*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that "[w]hen a patent 'simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform' and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious. This reasoning is applicable here. Regarding the combinability of the prior arts, where user can set their system profile and associate profile for other devices/terminal for configuration updates taught by Desai into the system of the Pierce to host user profile and associated peripheral device at remotely located central data center for remotely configuring peripheral (postage system are merely familiar elements combinable according to known methods in a manner that would have yielded predictable results.

29. In response to applicant's argument that "Donaldson explicitly states that the proxy is for incoming email only" this teaches away, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. In this case, Pierce teaches obtaining the user profile from the central data center to print postal indicia on an envelope further user profile is used to identify message data (col 4, lines 4-25). Desai teaches obtaining a peripheral identification data item to configuring the operating mode of the peripheral_device (device id, col 11, lines 40-45; col 13, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching where user can set their system profile and associate profile for other devices/terminal for configuration updates taught by Desai into the system of the Pierce to host user profile and associated peripheral device at remotely located central data center for remotely configuring peripheral (postage system). In view of the Supreme Court's recent opinion in KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., In KSR, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that "[w]hen a patent 'simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform' and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious. This reasoning is applicable here. Regarding the combinability of the prior arts, where user can set their system profile and associate profile for other devices/terminal for configuration updates taught by Desai into the system of the Pierce to host user profile and associated peripheral device at remotely located central data center for remotely configuring peripheral

(postage system are merely familiar elements combinable according to known methods in a manner that would have yielded predictable results.

Conclusion

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI whose telephone number is (571)272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154